

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/634,381	08/09	0/2000	Roy L. Hood	40333.0113	40333.0113 5176	
7590 10/21/2003				EXAMINER		
enneth D Goetz				PIERCE, JEREMY R		
Lathrop & Gage 2345 Grand Boulevard				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Suite 2800				1771		
Kansas City, MO 64018				DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

n		Application N .	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action		09/634,381	HOOD ET AL.					
		Examin r	Art Unit					
		Jeremy R. Pierce	1771					
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.								
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
have be 37 CFF	q ' ' ' ' ' <del></del>	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$  36(a) and the appropriate   fee. The appropriate ex  the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	shirts and the maining date of the infairte	ction, even in timery med,	may reduce any				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.								
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		. **				
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);								
(c	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the				
(d	) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claii	ns.				
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):						
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment				
5.🖂	The a) $\square$ affidavit, b) $\square$ exhibit, or c) $\boxtimes$ request fo application in condition for allowance because: $\underline{Se}$		sidered but does NO	OT place the				
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
7.	7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
	Claim(s) allowed:							
	Claim(s) objected to:		•					
	Claim(s) rejected:							
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Exam	ainer.				
9. <u> </u>	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme Other:	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	ELZA	STANDER ABETH M. COLE ARY EXAMINER				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/634,381

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Cejka does not teach the web of material is prepared from a three dimensional, unitary, molded, article comprising two distinct first and second polymers. However, Cejka does teach all elements of the Applicant's claims, as set forth in section 3 of the last Office Action. Applicant argues tha Rawlinson and Zuidamm are structurally different from the claimed invention. However, both references meet all the claimed limitations as set forth in sections 4 and 5 of the last Office Action..